

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 18 and 22 to 36 are pending. No claims are allowed, however, claims 6 to 9 and 23 are objected to.

Claims 6, 8, 10 to 16, 25 and 28 are cancelled. Claims 30 to 36 are new.

1. Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 11, 17 and 22 to 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,214,446).

Independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to set forth that "less than about 1 particle in 10^6 have a diameter greater than about four times the average diameter of the collection of particles." This subject matter was previously found in claims 6 and 23, which have been indicated to "be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1 and 17 are allowable over Bi et al. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 22 to 24, 26, 27 and 29 are patentable as hinging from allowable base claims. Claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 25 and 28 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to them.

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

2. Claims 1 to 3, 6 to 11, 17 and 22 to 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghantous et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,503,646).

For similar reasons as discussed in section 1 above, claims 1 to 3, 7, 9, 17, 22 to 24, 26, 27 and 29 are patentable.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 25 and 28 have been cancelled thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to them.

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

3. Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koksbang '214 (U.S. Patent No. 5,512,214).

For the reasons discussed in section 1 above, these independent claims are allowable over this prior art reference.

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

4. Claims 1, 2, 17, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koksbang '880 (U.S. Patent No. 5,549,880).

For the reasons discussed in section 1 above, these independent claims are allowable over this prior art reference.

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

5. Claims 1 to 3, 10, 22 and 24 to 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,556,738).

For similar reasons as discussed in section 1 above, claims 1 to 3, 22, 24, 26, 27 and 29 are patentable. Claims 10, 25 and 28 have been cancelled, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to them.

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

6. Claims 6 to 9 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed in section 1 above, the subject matter of claims 6 and 23 have been amended into respective independent claims 1 and 17. As amended, these independent claims are believed to be allowable. Claims 7 and 9 are patentable as hinging from an allowable base claim. Claim 8 has been cancelled.

7. Claims 30 to 36 are new.

New independent claim 30 essentially contains the combined subject matter of independent claim 1 and objected to claim 8. New claims 31 and 32 depend from new independent claim 30.

New claim 33 essentially contains the combined subject matter of independent claim 17 and objected to claim 8. New claims 34 to 36 depend from new independent claim 33.

It is believed that claim 1 to 3, 7, 9, 17, 18, 22 to 24, 26, 27 and 29 to 36 are now in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Scalise
Reg. No. 34,920

Greatbatch, Inc.
10,000 Wehrle Drive
Clarence, New York 14031
(716) 759-5810
September 22, 2009